Research Paper | Education | E-ISSN No : 2454-9916 | Volume : 3 | Issue : 5 | May 2017

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH AMONG +2 STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR LOCALITY AND STREAM OF STUDY

Nidhi Mahindroo

Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Education, H.P.U. Shimla-5.

ABSTRACT

The study compares the Content Knowledge of English among +2 Students of Shimla district in relation to their Locality and Stream of Study. A Sample of 600 students was selected randomly from the Shimla district of Himachal Pradesh. For comparing the data 2X2X2 ANOVA statistics technique was used. The result revealed that significant differences existed among rural and urban science and arts stream of English and Hindi medium students.

KEYWORDS: Content Knowledge, Locality, Stream of Study.

INTRODUCTION

English language has assumed a very important position and status in the modern world. The importance of English has been felt strongly in all spheres. With the advent of globalization, the whole world has been undergoing a radical transformation. As a matter of fact, English has become a vehicle of interaction not only in India but with entire international community as well. English has achieved a global status and has emerged as the lingua-franca of the world. Moreover, English language has been recognized as an international language throughout the world and the need for acquiring communicative competence in English will ever be felt in all circles. That's the reason that everyone seems to be strongly motivated to learn it though knowing at the same time that it will take a great deal to master it.

TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Every educational system has certain objectives which aim at bringing about desirable changes in pupil. In order to bring about those changes, the institutions arrange learning experience. The success of learning can be judged only in terms of the changes brought about by this experience. This is a learning experience and evaluation.

Thanks to the globalization in all the fields, it necessitates the learning of a language which is international. Undoubtedly, English has become a world language rather than the language of only the English speaking countries such as the UK and the USA because the number of the people who use English as a means of communication exceeds much more than the number of the people who speak it as their mother tongue. In the case of English in India, more than two centuries, India has been directly and indirectly had influence of the language , English on all the fields, such as Education, Medical Science, etc. Text materials relating to the subjects of Science, Engineering and Technology as also Medicine are available only in English. Moreover, all over India, there is no single language to unite the whole country. Since, in India, several languages are spoken and also one set of people are reluctant to learn one common Indian language, we have to borrow a new non-Indian language.

Considering the above facts, learning English, the universal language, as a Second Language, becomes inseparable branch as also unavoidable in Indian education system.

Content Knowledge

The integration of language and content should relate language learning, content learning, and the development of thinking, and should aim to find systematic connections among them.

Content knowledge refers to the amount and organisation of knowledge per see in the mind of the teacher and it makes the distinct subject matter. Having content knowledge means that students shows knowledge of the systems of the target language and competence in it. This means that the learner should have declarative knowledge of the language, i.e. knowledge about English grammar and phonetics, for instance, and be simultaneously proficient and confident users of it.

The five sets of synergistic classroom practices found throughout the adolescent literacy research to improve academic literacy development, including reading comprehension, and content-area learning throughout content areas:

(1) Specific attention to improving reading comprehension through teacher modeling, explicit strategy instruction in context, and use of formative assessment;

(2) More time spent reading and writing–more reading and writing assignments accompanied by more reading and writing instruction;

(3) More speaking, listening, and viewing related to the discussion, creation, and understanding of texts;

(4) More attention to the development of critical thinking and metacognitive skills as key parts of academic literacy tasks; and

(5) Flexible grouping and responsiveness to learner needs.

When teachers are totally, even mostly, focused on course content and the need to get it covered, that generally means the process side of teaching is being ignored or is getting short shrift. It's like focusing all your attention on developing the right side of your brain while pretending that the left side doesn't matter. In fact, development of one side only serves to accentuate lack of development on the other side.

Even though both are tightly linked and interdependent, they are still separate and discrete. Development of one doesn't automatically improve how the other functions. So you can work to grow content knowledge more and more, but if the methods used to convey that knowledge are not sophisticated and up to the task, teaching may still be quite ineffective. It may not inspire and motivate students. It may not result in more and better student learning. Because teachers so love the content, they almost never blame it. No, it's the students' fault. They aren't bright enough. They don't study enough. They don't deserve to be professionals in this field. Teachers are very good at getting their content off the hook.

Objectives

1. To Study the Content Knowledge of +2 students in English in relation to:
   (i) Locality
   (ii) Stream of Study
   (iii) Medium of Instruction

2. To Study the following two way interactional effect of variables on Content Knowledge of +2 students in English.
   (i) Locality
   (ii) Stream of Study
   (iii) Medium of Instruction

3. To Study three interactional effect of Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Content Knowledge of +2 students in English

Hypothesis

1. There is no significant difference in Content Knowledge of +2 students in English in relation to:
   (i) Locality
   (ii) Stream of Study
   (iii) Medium of Instruction

2. There is no significant two way interactional effect of variables on Content Knowledge of +2 students in English.
   (i) Locality
   (ii) Stream of Study
   (iii) Medium of Instruction

3. There is no significant three interactional effect of Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Content Knowledge of +2 students in English.

Method and Procedure

Sample: A Sample of 300 students of +2 class was drawn randomly from selected schools of Shimla district.

Tools used: in the present study a Self-developed tool was used. The questionnaire was administered on rural and urban students of +2 class of randomly selected schools of Shimla district of Himachal Pradesh.

Scoring: Content Knowledge high scores indicates proficiency in English. Students with low scores are not proficient in English.

Analysis of Data

In order to study the effects of locality, steam of study and medium of instruction on Content Knowledge of +2 students, 2X2X2 ANOVA involving two levels of locality, two levels of stream of study and two levels of medium of instruction at +2 level, was employed.

TABLE: 4.6
Means at Different Levels

MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	LOCALITY				TOTAL
	URBAN		RURAL		
	STREAM OF STUDY		STREAM OF STUDY		
	Science	Arts	Science	Arts	
ENGLISH	30.15	20.25	30.25	29.55	29.55
HINDI	25.58	23.92	25.20	23.80	24.62
TOTAL	27.87	26.08	27.72	26.67	27.08
Combined (Locality)	27.2 (Urban)		27.0 (Rural)		
Combined (Stream of Study)	27.80 (Science)		26.37 (Arts)		

TABLE: 4.7
Summary of ANNOVA: Content Knowledge of English of +2 Students in Relation to Locality and Stream of Study

Sources	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares	F
Locality	.003	1	.003	.000
Stream of Study	133.90	1	133.90	1.72
Medium of Instruction	2116.65	1	2116.65	16.43
Locality X Stream of Study	1.65	1	1.65	.132
Locality X Medium of Instruction	10.15	1	10.15	.813
Stream of Study X Medium of Instruction	8.78	1	8.78	.703
Locality X Stream of Study X Medium of Instruction	1.13	1	1.13	.090
Within Groups	3897.83	312	12.49	
Total	241995.00	320		

**Significant at 0.05 level of Significance*

*** Significant at 0.01 level of Significance*

Locality

The F-Value for Content Knowledge of Rural and Urban students has come out to be .000 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence for 1/312 df. In the light of this, hypothesis 6 (i) stated as, "there is no significant difference in Content Knowledge in English among Rural and Urban students at +2 Stage" is rejected. It is indicated that there is significant difference in the Content Knowledge in English of Rural and Urban Students at +2 Stage

Further it can be seen that mean scores of Rural students is 27.0 and that of Urban students is 27.2. Since, the mean score for the Urban students is higher to that of Rural students, it shows that Urban students have better Content Knowledge of English as compared to Rural students

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Rural and Urban students differ significantly from each other in Content Knowledge of Urban students have better Content Knowledge in English as compared to Rural Students at +2 Stage
Stream of Study

The F-Value for Content Knowledge of Science and Arts stream students has come out to be 10.71 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence for 1/312 df. In the light of this, hypothesis 6(ii) stated as, "there is no significant difference in Content Knowledge in English among Science and Arts stream students at +2 Stage" is rejected. It is indicated that there is significant difference in the Content Knowledge in English of Science and Arts Students at +2 Stage

Further it can be seen that mean scores of Science stream students is 27.80 and that of Arts stream students is 26.37. Since, the mean score for the Science stream students is higher to that of Arts stream students. It shows that students from Science stream have better Content Knowledge of English as compared to students from Arts stream.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Science and Arts stream students differ significantly from each other in Content Knowledge of English and Science students have better Content Knowledge in English as compared to Arts Students at +2 Stage

Medium of Instruction

The F-Value for Content Knowledge of English and Hindi medium students has come out to be 169.43 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence for 1/312 df. In the light of this, hypothesis 6(iii) stated as, "there is no significant difference in Content Knowledge in English among English and Hindi students at +2 Stage" is rejected. It is indicated that there is significant difference in the Content Knowledge in English of English and Hindi Medium Students at +2 Stage

Further it can be seen that mean scores of English medium students is 29.55 and that of Hindi medium students is 24.62. Since, the mean score for the English medium students is higher to that of Hindi medium students; it shows that English medium students have better Content Knowledge of English as compared to Hindi medium students.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that English and Hindi students differ significantly from each other in Content Knowledge of English and Science students have better Content Knowledge in English as compared to Arts Students at +2 Stage

Two way Interaction

Locality X Stream of Study

It can also be seen that computed value of F for the interactional effect of Locality and Stream of Study on the Content Knowledge of +2 Student has come out to be .132 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence foe 1/312 df. It shows that there is significant interactional effect of Locality and Stream of Study on Content Knowledge of English of +2 Students.

In the light of this, hypothesis 7 stated as, "there is no significant interactional effect of Locality and Stream of Study on Content Knowledge in English of students at +2 Stage.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Locality and Stream of Study taken together effects the Content Knowledge of English at +2 Stage.

Locality X Medium of Instruction

The computed value of F for the interactional effect of Locality and Medium of Instruction on the Content Knowledge of +2 Student has come out to be .813 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence foe 1/312 df. It shows that there is significant interactional effect of Locality and Medium of Instruction on Content Knowledge of English of +2 Students.

In the light of this, hypothesis 8 stated as, "There is no significant interactional effect of Locality and Medium of Instruction on Content Knowledge in English of students at +2 Stage.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Locality and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Content Knowledge of English at +2 Stage.

Stream of Study X Medium of Instruction

The computed value of F for the interactional effect of Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on the Content Knowledge of +2 Student has come out to be .703 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence for 1/312 df. It shows that there is significant interactional effect of Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Content Knowledge of English of +2 Students.

In the light of this, hypothesis 9 stated as, "there is no significant interactional effect of Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Content Knowledge in English of students at +2 Stage.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Content Knowledge of English at +2 Stage.
Locality X Stream of Study X Medium of Instruction

The computed value of F for the interactional effect of Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on the Content Knowledge of +2 Student has come out to be .090 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence foe 1/312 df. It shows that there is significant interactional effect of Locality and Stream of Study on Content Knowledge of English of +2 Students.

In the light of this, hypothesis 10 stated as, "there is no significant interactional effect of Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Content Knowledge in English of students at +2 Stage".

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Content Knowledge of English at +2 Stage

CONCLUSION

On the basis of analysis and interpretation of data, the following conclusions can be laid down:

1. Rural and Urban students differ significantly from each other in Content Knowledge of English
2. Urban students at +2 Stage have better Content Knowledge of English as compared to Rural students.
3. Science and Arts stream students differ significantly from each other in Content Knowledge of English
4. Students from Science stream have better Content Knowledge of English as compared to students from Arts stream.
5. Students of +2 Stage with English and Hindi medium differ significantly from each other in Content Knowledge of English
6. English medium students of +2 Stage have better Content Knowledge of English as compared to Hindi medium students.
7. Locality and Stream of Study taken together effects the Content Knowledge of English at +2 Stage.
8. Locality and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Content Knowledge of English at +2 Stage.
9. Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Content Knowledge of English at +2 Stage.
10. Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Content Knowledge of English at +2

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

1. The effects of English language proficiency and levels of scientific reasoning skills and their influence on the performance of +2 Class English language learners and native English language speaking students on Language Proficiency test and Content Knowledge.
2. There is perhaps a relationship between English language proficiency and English content learning. The effect of English language proficiency as factors on the learning of English content knowledge of English language learners.
3. Assessments measure language proficiency as well as actual content knowledge. Oral or written assessments inevitably measure learners English skills as well as, or even more than, the content being tested. It is easy for English-language difficulties to obscure what students actually know.
4. The domains of language acquisition, Speaking, Writing, Reading and Listening need to be equally exercised across content areas daily. Assuring that students are using all domains of language acquisition to support their English language development is essential.
5. Teacher should find out when and how a student's English language proficiency is assessed and the results of those assessments. Using the results of formal and informal assessments can provide a wealth of information to aid in planning lessons that support language acquisition and content knowledge simultaneously.

REFERENCES

1. Ball, D.L., Thames, M.H., & Phelps, G. (2005) Content Knowledge for Teaching: What makes it Special? Retrieved from American Educational Research Journal. Retrieved on 15/08/13 from http://www.conferences.illinoisstate.edu/nsa/papers/thamesphelps.pdf
2. Duhaney, L. M. G. (1999). A Content Analysis of State Education Agencies' Policies/Position Statements on Inclusion, Remedial and Special Education; Vol. 20, No. 6; pp. 367-378, Sage Publication
3. Good, Carter. A , A S Barr and Douglas, E. Scates (1941), Methodology of Educational Research New York Appleton-Century, Crofts, Inc.
4. Hector N. Torres University of Massachusetts and Dana L. Zeidler University of South Florida(2002)The Effects of English Language Proficiency and Scientific Reasoning Skills on the Acquisition of Science Content Knowledge by Hispanic English Language Learners and Native English Language Speaking Students. Retrieved on 24/10/14 from http://wolfweb.unr.edu/homepage/crowther/ejse/torreszeidler.pdf